

Page 5386

Page 5388

1 Q. What about the other states in the New
2 England region? Will they have their line-sharing
3 metrics implemented at the same time?
4 A. [CANNY] Most of the other states in New
5 England do not have carrier guidelines. The
6 exception is, I believe, Vermont, which has accepted
7 New York in the same way that Massachusetts has.

8 MS. REED: Thank you, I have nothing
9 further.

10 MS. CARPINO: AT&T or WorldCom, any
11 questions?

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. GRUBER:

14 Q. I'll ask my standard question on the subject
15 of metrics. I just want to make sure that you agree
16 with Mr. Maguire on the scenario that we discussed a
17 few days ago, and I'll describe what I thought he
18 said, and you can tell me whether you agree with it
19 or not.

20 We were talking about scoring hot cuts.
21 Again, it's this notion of under the scenario -- and
22 you may have been present that day. Under the
23 scenario that I was describing, we've reached the
24 day of the cut itself, and the Bell Atlantic

1 questions to Ms. Canny and Mr. Maguire when they
2 were here. I think those were answered then.

3 MR. GRUBER: I'd like to get an answer
4 to my question. We're both here.

5 MR. ROWE: Then I would suggest that we
6 object to the question being repeated.

7 MS. CARPINO: Mr. Gruber, how much more
8 do you have in terms of this questioning?

9 MR. GRUBER: Very little.

10 MS. CARPINO: We'll allow it.

11 A. [CANNY] The issue of accuracy -- are you
12 coming from the accuracy perspective of reviewing
13 data? -- is part of our wholesale quality-assurance
14 review process, and the center that handles that is
15 reviewed on a sampling basis to make sure that we're
16 actually capturing data correctly.

17 Q. How do they do that?

18 A. [CANNY] The specifics of the review process
19 I don't have with me -- although I may have some of
20 it. (Pause.)

21 I do not have my wholesale quality-
22 assurance program with me. To the best of my
23 knowledge, it's a review of the narrative logs in
24 WFA to ensure consistency with the ultimate scoring.

Page 5387

Page 5389

1 technician is unable to identify dial tone coming
2 from the CLEC's switch and so notifies the CLEC, and
3 as a result the CLEC requests the order to be
4 supp.ed to a new day, and it's later determined
5 that, in this hypothetical, a Bell Atlantic
6 technician was looking on the wrong cable and pair
7 when he found no dial tone and that in fact there
8 was dial tone in the right place.

9 Just assuming that scenario, how would
10 that order be scored? First of all, tell me how
11 that order would be scored, as a met or miss or
12 what?

13 A. [CANNY] If our records indicate that the
14 Bell Atlantic technician did not correctly identify
15 the dial tone and we did subsequently find it, that
16 would be scored as a Bell Atlantic miss.

17 Q. According to Mr. Maguire, it would not be
18 scored, however, until that line was eventually
19 completed or worked; is that right?

20 A. [CANNY] That's correct.

21 Q. Do you have any procedures in place to
22 ensure that the results of subsequent investigations
23 get into your scoring?

24 MR. ROWE: I think we had these same

1 Q. Does it include interviews with the
2 technicians that reported -- that made the records
3 in the WFA log?

4 MR. ROWE: These are the questions that
5 Mr. Maguire answered the last time we had this
6 subject.

7 MR. GRUBER: I don't remember that.

8 MS. CARPINO: If the witness is unable
9 to answer, she's unable to answer. Let's move
10 along.

11 Q. Would you have any objection to sharing with
12 the relevant CLEC the information that's in your
13 logs regarding scoring?

14 MR. ROWE: Mr. Maguire answered that as
15 well when he provided Bell Atlantic's position on
16 the subject.

17 MS. CARPINO: Next question, Mr. Gruber?

18 MR. GRUBER: There's a question pending.

19 MS. CARPINO: Next question, Mr. Gruber,
20 please.

21 MR. GRUBER: I don't have any further
22 questions.

23 MS. CARPINO: Does WorldCom?

24 MS. KINARD: Thank you.

Page 5390

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. KINARD:

Q. First of all, I want to ask a question that was a data request but that Ms. Carpino had said I should ask Verizon directly, rather than KPMG. I think she's talked to you about that.

A. It's on the service-quality measurement issue, about the denominator not matching up with what you were doing, where it was said you aligned this with New York. I know in New York we're talking about changing the definition of the denominator, and I'm just unclear on what you're changing it to.

A. [CANNY] Actually this was a consensus item in the carrier-to-carrier work group in New York, and actually consensus, I think, in New Jersey beforehand.

The words that were written in the numerator were not as clear as they could have been. I wrote them, so guilty as charged of writing them unclearly. We have been measuring installation quality the same way since January, 1997, I believe. When we realized through discussions with KPMG that the language was not as clear as it could have been,

Page 5392

metrics not reported in New York, and manual loop qualification, engineering record provisioning, flow-through don't have dates, they just have "to be determined." Also hot cut is to be determined. I kind of understand why hot cuts are to be determined, but I'm not sure I understand why the other ones are to be determined.

A. [CANNY] I'll take them one at a time. The manual loop qualification measures are to measure a new preorder request to have an electronic request for manual loop qualification without requesting a service order. That is a whole new transaction that must go through the change-control process. In other words, we have to create an OSS transaction to measure it. So our ability to measure it is dependent on the transaction existing.

It's my understanding that that request, which was to have come from the DLECs, was to have gone through our large change-management process, so that a separate preorder transaction could be created, and we're more or less held hostage to the creation of that transaction.

MR. ROWE: Large change-management process, you're referring to the OSS as

Page 5391

we put forth a proposal, initially in New Jersey and ultimately in New York, to the carrier working group to change the denominator to reflect the total lines installed in a calendar month, and we reached consensus on that in New York.

Again, the process to get that finalized is to put forth our consensus items to the New York commission. Once they're approved, they're in the guidelines. But that's how we left it. There's no change in the measurement, because we're measuring it the same way we always have.

Q. And looking back over the New York consensus one, I have a question that would apply in all states. With the change in the denominator that doesn't change the way you've been calculating this, in the numerator are you still capturing any new order that would have a review period, whether it's seven days or 30 days, in the month in question, and it's only the denominator that would be completions in that month?

A. [CANNY] That's correct.

Q. The other question I have, I did see a copy of your response to the Data Request 235, on the dates when you would provide reporting on certain

Page 5393

change-management process, not the metric.

WITNESS CANNY: Correct.

A. [CANNY] With regard to the flow-through-achieved issue, it's fairly much along the same lines. Because of the nonconsensus issue in New York, we're waiting to see what the results will be in the New York order on the flow-through metric before continuing programming in Massachusetts. We could in essence produce a number in Massachusetts. However, because we still have to work through the differences in orders, when you go service order by service order, as Ms. DeVito said in her testimony, there are different services offered in Massachusetts than in New York on the retail side, and correspondingly different services in wholesale. So there's still some work to be done there. We're waiting to get the resolution from the carrier working group on this measure before continuing to do any more programming.

Q. Now, there's an open issue in the metrics proceeding where the commission is going to look at whether they should go back in time based on the New York flow-through calculations and determine whether a remedy should be imposed in Massachusetts. They

Page 5394

1 closed out the consolidated-arbitration flow-through
2 issue, where it took Bell Atlantic over a year to
3 provide a flow-through metric, and said that would
4 be dealt with in this proceeding, and they'd decide
5 then whether, based on the New York reporting, they
6 would go back in time to pick up any remedies that
7 might be due. Could you with this metric, when
8 that's finalized, go back in time and calculate it
9 according to these flow-through exclusions?

10 A. [CANNY] I have no idea what you're -- I
11 don't know. I don't believe that was the metric
12 that was decided upon.

13 Q. What do you mean, what metric was decided
14 on?

15 A. [CANNY] I don't know that we can go
16 backwards and recreate data that may not have been
17 captured at that time. It really depends on what
18 the order ends up with. I can't answer that
19 question.

20 Q. So there's no way -- I mean, we've just been
21 waiting a long time in Massachusetts for a flow-
22 through metric at all, and we're still going to wait
23 an unbeknownst long time --

24 A. [CANNY] We are reporting total flow-through

Page 5396

1 harmed in that regard, and we have not met the
2 standard that was set in the New York PAP plan, and
3 so we've been paying substantial remedies in that
4 regard. So there's not really harm to be made, and
5 I'm not sure that anyone's harmed by not reporting
6 metrics.

7 Q. Maybe "harm" wasn't the right word. I was
8 just trying to say, if you had with all the other
9 metrics started reporting it the New York way, you
10 would be reporting it the way you wanted to keep
11 reporting it, with the same inclusions and
12 exclusions?

13 A. [CANNY] In Massachusetts?

14 Q. Yes.

15 A. [CANNY] As I said, we still have work to do
16 with regard to the identification of what orders are
17 eligible for flow-through. The exclusions, et
18 cetera, the reasons for fallout I think are pretty
19 much the same in New York and Massachusetts, but
20 there are some specific products that we'd have to
21 go through line by line, and that has not been
22 finalized yet for Mass.

23 Q. Because I thought you had said in testimony
24 the week before that design to flow-through and the

Page 5395

1 and have been reporting total flow-through for some
2 time. The flow-through-achieved metric we have not
3 reported, for the reasons I mentioned before.

4 Q. And as I understand the exclusions and
5 inclusions we're debating in New York, you pretty
6 much want to stay the same, it's the CLECs that want
7 to change.

8 MR. ROWE: I'm going to interject here.
9 There is a protective order in effect in New York on
10 work in progress.

11 Can you answer the question without
12 violating the order?

13 WITNESS CANNY: No, I cannot.

14 Q. I thought it was general.

15 A. [CANNY] Actually, our positions in this
16 regard, because we did file last week, are public.
17 I can't say who said what. But we have publicized
18 what our position is. And yes, our position is not
19 to change the definition.

20 Q. So if you started reporting on it that way,
21 you wouldn't be harmed, it would be the CLECs, if
22 you did the reporting according to the New York
23 metric.

24 A. [CANNY] I would not say that anyone was

Page 5397

1 system-error message for what falls out were the
2 same.

3 A. [CANNY] And Ms. DeVito further stated that
4 there are some products that are available in New
5 York that are not available in Massachusetts and
6 vice-versa. So that still has to be resolved, the
7 differences in the products that are available.

8 Q. And then for the EELs measurement, it's now
9 you're going to start reporting in December or --

10 A. [CANNY] Yes.

11 Q. For December data.

12 A. [CANNY] We have had difficulty with the
13 implementation of the EELs performance measures.
14 There has been no activity from a provisioning
15 perspective on EELs. One of the methods that you
16 use to test your metrics is to test it on actual
17 orders, and there has been no ability to do that.

18 The issue is our ability to capture
19 migrations from special access to EEL. We're having
20 a great deal of difficulty with that programming
21 effort. So it got pushed into the next release
22 because it's not ready for October.

23 Q. Going back to the manual loop qualification:
24 You did provide a chart of data, not part of the

Page 5398

Page 5400

1 metrics, that 95 percent of annual loop
2 qualification data was -- or information was
3 provided in 72 hours, and the New York standard is
4 48 hours. I was wondering why you used 72?

5 A. [CANNY] 72, actually because that included
6 the LSR. The 72 hours -- one of the surrogate
7 measures we have for manual loop qual or manual
8 engineering record request is right now the process
9 for getting a manual loop qual or a manual
10 engineering request is to issue an LSR. When we get
11 an LSR that is not checked off that a loop qual was
12 done upfront, we do a manual one. So what the TISOC
13 did to supplement it was to look at that same
14 performance and to see how we did for manual LSRs.

15 So the LSR standard is 72 hours. That
16 allows us the time to get the LSRC back. So 48
17 hours of that 72 hours is the loop qual. We
18 measured the whole time frame from receipt of the
19 LSR to sending the LSR when a manual loop qual was
20 involved. It's more of a subset of the LSRC time
21 than it is just a loop qual.

22 Q. I was looking at, I believe, the July -- or
23 I know it was the July data.

24 Is installation quality under ordering

1 A. [CANNY] I don't have all my details to go
2 into that. This is an example of one of our
3 like-for-like comparisons is not right here. We
4 still have POTS services embedded in our comparator.

5 Q. When you say "POTS services" --

6 A. [CANNY] The guidelines call for us to
7 compare to a combination of POTS and complex. We
8 have not disaggregated retail DSL or retail two-wire
9 digital services in the guidelines. We tried to do
10 that in our discussion in some of the earlier
11 information that I believe was shared at the DSL
12 section of the proceeding.

13 MS. CARPINO: I'll go back and look at
14 the testimony, since I wasn't there.

15 Q. Going to the change control for metrics
16 issue: Was the issue with KPMG that you weren't
17 following the plan you had since New York, or you
18 didn't have a plan for Massachusetts for change
19 control for metrics?

20 A. [CANNY] I believe there were some issues of
21 us not following the plan that we have as well, and
22 they have gone back and done replication. And we
23 have taken a lot of steps to ensure adherence to the
24 plan. But there was not a question that we didn't

Page 5399

Page 5401

1 or provisioning?

2 A. [CANNY] Provisioning. PR 6.

3 A. [ABESAMIS] Dash-01.

4 Q. For the digital services, and I believe also
5 for the xDSL, too, there are higher troubles after
6 install on those metrics for both the two-wire
7 digital and the two-wire xDSL digital. For xDSL
8 it's 2.97 percent for you, 8.45 percent for the
9 CLECs.

10 MS. CARPINO: Ms. Kinard, where are you
11 looking, again?

12 MS. KINARD: I'm looking under the UNE
13 provisioning, under xDSL grouping PR-6, installation
14 quality.

15 Q. We haven't gone back to the digital
16 services, but there's an even larger difference
17 there. That's 1.23 for retail, 11.59 for the CLECs.
18 I know just other things, when it looks out of
19 parity, you have an explanation that it really isn't
20 out of parity because of some issue.

21 MR. ROWE: And that was the subject of
22 hours of discussion at the xDSL group.

23 A. [CANNY] Right.

24 Q. I wasn't there, so I'm sorry.

1 have one.

2 Q. Is that plan the same as the one in New
3 York?

4 A. [CANNY] Absolutely.

5 Q. In the month that the commission is going to
6 monitor, which I believe is July --

7 COMMISSIONER VASINGTON: I think it was
8 August.

9 MS. KINARD: August. I'm sorry.

10 Q. -- there will be changes coming up in that
11 month to look for?

12 A. [CANNY] Oh, yes. I think we have one every
13 month, Karen.

14 Q. And I also had asked KPMG, but I'll ask you
15 directly: In your measurements comments you talk
16 about a change in the way delay days were measured
17 and a change in the way the retail analog for
18 interoffice facilities was measured and changed in
19 the data. You said for interoffice facilities some
20 of what was used as the retail analog were
21 appropriate and there were actually, I forget, 41 or
22 43 items that you would use as an analog. I was
23 wondering if those had gone through the change-
24 control process and, even if they have, if you could

Page 5402

1 describe why only that group of what the guidelines
2 said should be used as the retail analog for
3 interoffice facilities should be used.

4 A. [CANNY] First of all, I could not issue a
5 change control to make that happen until I got the
6 guidelines to be changed, because right now the
7 guidelines just say, for instance, special services.
8 So this is in my opening statement, when I talked
9 about findings of not having the right retail
10 analog. The next step is to go to the carrier
11 working group and say we need to either, A.
12 disaggregate, or pick a retail analog, and I have
13 not done that.

14 Q. Maybe I misunderstood your measurements
15 testimony. I thought you said you found this
16 problem, you went back and changed the data, and
17 going forward the --

18 A. [ABESAMIS] Maybe I can clarify that. It's
19 mentioned in both our testimonies, in May, but in
20 August as well. I think you're switching around
21 what it is we were referring to. We did a study on
22 IOF because IOF is a disaggregation of special
23 services, and we found when we looked at IOF and
24 what we were comparing it to, it wasn't analogous.

Page 5403

1 So we did a study that said a DSL
2 function, provisioning of that, is similar to what
3 we provision in IOF, and that was the study that we
4 showed in our affidavit. Along with that study, we
5 also found that we were counting ADSL in our retail
6 side of our business in special services in error.
7 So the testimony states that we corrected counting
8 that in error because we count ADSL in complex as
9 well as in specials, and you can't count it in two
10 places. So we've removed that, and that's what's
11 been fixed. But the actual comparison of special
12 services retail to IOF, as Julie mentioned, is a
13 guideline issue, and we need to bring that before
14 the carrier working group in order to change the
15 guidelines in that case.

16 Q. So you were just pointing out changing to
17 that DSL rather than all specials, but you didn't go
18 back and do it in the reporting for Massachusetts.

19 A. [ABESAMIS] That's correct. It was an
20 example. What was corrected, though, to your point
21 is, when we identified that we had ADSL circuits in
22 our special-services retail base, we went and also
23 found them in our complex-services retail base. We
24 removed them from special services. It was an error

Page 5404

1 in coding. So that's what was removed.

2 Q. And on the delay days, there was talk of
3 changing the calculation of delay days in your
4 testimony?

5 A. [ABESAMIS] No. The clarification on that
6 is that average delay days last year, a year ago,
7 when we were reviewing them, we found that not only
8 was the Verizon delay day included in delay-day
9 calculations for special services, but also if the
10 customer was not ready. And it was a system problem
11 that we found in WFA that was continuing the delay
12 day even when Bell Atlantic, or now Verizon, was not
13 at fault.

14 So we put a system change in that took
15 effect in January and corrected the January, 2000
16 data, that if Verizon misses the appointment the
17 delay days begin to accumulate, but if, say,
18 WorldCom misses it, we're not going to score that
19 delay against ourselves. And that's what the
20 testimony stated.

21 Q. So is this the issue from New York where I
22 thought -- I thought it had changed earlier than
23 this, earlier than January, but maybe I was just
24 remembering when we talked about it, not when it

Page 5405

1 changed -- where you miss an appointment, you're
2 counting delay days, you give us a new due date, you
3 miss that due date for a customer not ready that
4 really is our fault, you just count up to that
5 mistake for the delay day on the first order.
6 Right?

7 A. [ABESAMIS] Correct, and we appoint the
8 order if the customer is not ready, and if on the
9 second appointment Verizon goes and we happen to
10 miss the order, that delay day, if it was two days
11 for the first delay and then the customer wasn't
12 ready as the second piece, and then Verizon has an
13 additional two days, the average delay day to
14 complete that order would be four days, regardless
15 if the CLEC took ten more days for us to reappoint.

16 Q. And then the clock would begin as of a new
17 order following on from that, for the next due date,
18 given from -- if we have a customer not ready --
19 first it's your fault we miss, then it's your fault,
20 then if we miss again, it's your fault -- the days
21 are just added from --

22 A. [CANNY] Let me summarize this. The
23 situation occurs where we have both a Verizon miss
24 and a CLEC miss on the same order, or multiple

Page 5406

1 misses. What we have done is to attribute the delay
2 days to either party. So that any delay -- if there
3 were three different Verizon misses and one CLEC, we
4 count all delays on the Verizon miss, not just the
5 last one. We accumulate all the delays associated
6 with Verizon and back out any delays that are
7 attributable to the CLEC. We do the same thing on
8 retail.

9 MS. KINARD: Thank you. That's all my
10 questions.

11 MS. CARPINO: Ms. Reed?

12 MS. REED: This refers to the carrier-
13 to-carrier guideline metrics. Am I correct in
14 understanding that Verizon will continue to
15 distribute their performance on these metrics after
16 today's hearing and will be filing those with the
17 Department? Am I correct in understanding that?

18 MR. BEAUSEJOUR: That's correct.

19 MS. REED: Will that continue on for the
20 next three or four years on a monthly basis, as far
21 as the filing of the reports?

22 MR. BEAUSEJOUR: However long the
23 Commission would like us to file.

24 MS. REED: Then perhaps my question

Page 5408

1 MS. CARPINO: The Department has no
2 questions. Thank you very much.

3 Ms. Kinard, do you have a statement on
4 metrics?

5 MS. KINARD: I said it last week.

6 MS. CARPINO: I would thank all the
7 witnesses. You are survivors of the 271 technical
8 hearings. Unfortunately, we don't have a million
9 dollars to give you, but you do have our thanks for
10 being here on the Friday before Labor Day weekend.

11 Is there anything that we need to
12 address before we go off the record?

13 MR. BEAUSEJOUR: Off the record, I'd
14 like to address something.

15 MS. CARPINO: Thank you. We are
16 finished.

17 (3:10 p.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Page 5407

1 should be directed to the Commission rather than
2 Verizon. I would like to be included in receiving
3 copies of those carrier-to-carrier metrics.

4 MS. CARPINO: You should already as a
5 participant to --

6 MS. REED: I do now. But when this
7 hearing finishes? Will we continue to get those
8 metrics? Thank you.

9 MS. KINARD: That triggered one other
10 question.

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION
12 BY MS. KINARD:

13 Q. The reporting you're doing under carrier-
14 to-carrier is only aggregate. CLECs won't get
15 reporting until the Commission finishes its
16 permanent proceeding; right?

17 A. [CANNY] That's my understanding.

18 Q. We haven't been seeing their reporting on
19 our individual orders with them under this rule.
20 It's just been the aggregate reporting.

21 A. [CANNY] You do, however, get your
22 consolidated-arbitration reports.

23 MS. KINARD: It's not enough.
24 (Laughter.)

Page 5409

1 **C E R T I F I C A T E**

2 I, Alan H. Brock, Registered Professional
3 Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
4 transcript is a true and accurate transcription of
5 my stenographic notes taken on September 1, 2000.
6
7
8

9 _____
10 Alan H. Brock, RDR/CRR
11
12

13 **I N D E X**
14

15 Checklist Item No. 1 (trunking), Page 5256
16 DONALD ALBERT and JULIE CANNY

17 5267 by Mr. Gruber

18 5298 by Ms. Kinard

19 5304 by Mr. McDonald

20 5307 by Ms. Kinard

21 5313 by Mr. McDonald

22 5320 by Ms. Kinard

23 5321 by Mr. McDonald

24 5323 by Ms. Kinard